arXiv:solv-int/9811007v1 10 Nov 1998

ON A CLASS OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS BOTH QUASI-BI-HAMILTONIAN AND BI-HAMILTONIAN

C. MOROSI † AND G. TONDO ‡

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza L. Da Vinci 32,

I-20133 Milano, Italy

‡Department of Applied Mathematical Studies, University of Leeds,

Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Abstract. It is shown that a class of dynamical systems (encompassing the one recently considered by F. Calogero in [1]) is both quasi-bi-Hamiltonian and bi-Hamiltonian. The first formulation entails the separability of these systems; the second one is obtained trough a non canonical map whose form is directly suggested by the associated Nijenhuis tensor.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 58F07; Secondary 58F05, 70H20.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

The aim of this Letter is to point out some properties of a class of dynamical systems which admit both a quasi-bi-Hamiltonian (QBH) formulation and a bi-Hamiltonian (BH) formulation.

Let M be an even dimensional differentiable manifold ($\dim M = 2n$), TM and T^*M its tangent and cotangent bundle: a bi-Hamiltonian structure on M is a pair (P_0, P_1) ($P_0,\ P_1 : T^*M \mapsto TM$) of two compatible Poisson tensors [3]. If P_0 is invertible and the Nijenhuis tensor $N := P_1\, P_0^{-1}$ has n functionally independent eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ one can introduce a set of canonical coordinates $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{\mu})$ ($\boldsymbol{\lambda} := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n); \boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$) referred to as Darboux-Nijenhuis coordinates [4] such that P_0, P_1 and N take the matrix form

$$P_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix}\ , \qquad P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Lambda \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{bmatrix}\ , \qquad N = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda \end{bmatrix}\ , \tag{1.1}$$

where I denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $\Lambda := diag(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. The above form of the BH structure will be referred to as a *canonical* BH structure.

We recall that the local model of a BH structure was studied in [5], where it was shown that a compatible pair (P_0, P_1) of Poisson tensors (being P_0 invertible) admits a representation with P_0 constant and P_1 depending linearly on the coordinates; the Darboux–Nijenhuis coordinates are just a particular realization of this representation: the eigenvalues of N are the first n coordinates and the remaining ones are constructed by quadratures [4].

A vector field X is said to be bi-Hamiltonian w.r.t. (P_0, P_1) if there exist two smooth functions h_0 and h_1 such that

$$X = P_0\, dh_1 = P_1\, dh_0\ , \tag{1.2}$$

d denoting the exterior derivative.

Under the above assumption on the eigenvalues of N, a BH vector field is completely integrable, a set of independent involutive integrals being just the eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ [6]. However, it has been proved in [7, 8] that a very strong condition has to be satisfied by a completely integrable system (Hamiltonian w.r.t. P_0) in order to have a BH formulation in a neighborhood of an invariant Liouville torus, at least if one searches for a second Poisson tensor compatible with P_0. Nevertheless, the property of Liouville integrability, can be related with geometrical structures which are actually different from the canonical BH structure. This can be done in (at least) three distinct ways.

i) Searching for a BH formulation without the canonical Poisson structure P_0 [9] (hereafter referred to as a *non canonical* BH formulation). The BH structure

constructed in Sect. 3 and the one considered in Sect. 4 are just applications of such a construction.

ii) Admitting a degenerate BH formulation [10]; for instance, this is the case of the rigid body with a fixed point [11, 12, 13] and of the stationary flows of the KdV hierarchy [14, 15].

iii) Searching for a quasi–bi–Hamiltonian formulation of X [16, 17].

In connection with the third approach, we recall that the vector field X is said to be quasi-bi-Hamiltonian w.r.t. (P_0, P_1) [16] if there exist three smooth functions H, K and ρ such that

$$X = P_0\, dH = \frac{1}{\rho} P_1\, dK \ ; \tag{1.3}$$

in particular, if ρ is the product of the eigenvalues of the Nijenhuis tensor $N = P_1\, P_0^{-1}$, i.e.,

$$\rho = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \ , \tag{1.4}$$

the QBH vector field X is said to be Pfaffian.

It has beeen proved in [16] that any completely integrable system with two degrees of freedom has a QBH formulation in a neighborhood of a Liouville torus. Furthermore, for a Pfaffian QBH vector field with n degrees of freedom we proved [17] that the general solution of Eq.(1.3), written in the Darboux-Nijenhuis coordinates, is

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f_i(\lambda_i; \mu_i)}{\prod_{j\neq i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)} \ , \qquad K = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\rho_i\, f_i(\lambda_i; \mu_i)}{\prod_{j\neq i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)} \qquad (\rho_i := \prod_{j\neq i} \lambda_j) \tag{1.5}$$

where each functionf_i is an arbitrary smooth function, at most depending on one pair $(\lambda_i; \mu_i)$. A remarkable feature of H and K is that they are separable (in the sense of Hamilton-Jacobi) as they verify the Levi–Civita condition [18], therefore the corresponding Hamilton equations are integrable by quadratures. We stress the fact that, owing to the arbitrariness of f_i, the functions H and K (1.5) provide a class of separable functions different from the known Stäckel class (e.g., see [19, p. 101]).

The previous results have been completed in [20], where it has been shown that a QBH vector field X admits n integrals of motion in involution $F_k\, (k = 1, \dots, n)$

$$F_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial \lambda_i} \frac{f_i(\lambda_i; \mu_i)}{\prod_{j\neq i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)} \ , \tag{1.6}$$

where $c_1, \dots, c_n$ are the the coefficients of the minimal polynomial of the Nijenhuis tensor N.

$$\lambda^n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \lambda^{n-i} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\lambda - \lambda_i) \ ; \tag{1.7}$$

in particular, $F_1 = -H, F_n = (-1)^n K$. Furthermore, each function F_k turns out to be separable.

A natural question arises about the mutual relations between the different formulations of the above items. In this regard, we observe that a few examples of QBH systems, such those considered in [17, 20] can be obtained as highly not trivial reductions of degenerate BH systems [15]. However the relation between the BH and the QBH formulation for a given vector field and the very existence of one or both structures is not yet completely clarified. An open problem, which we are not going to examine here, is to give conditions assuring that a given integrable vector field with n–degrees of freedom admits globally a QBH formulation. Since a theoretical result for $n > 2$ is still lacking, it seems to us of some interest to collect and classify examples of such systems. In this Letter our aim is just to discuss in some details an explicit example of a system admitting both formulations. Its phase space is an open dense submanifold of R^{2n}, so that its QBH and BH formulations are globally defined.

2. THE DYNAMICAL SYSTEM AND ITS CANONICAL QBH FORMULATION

Let $M = R^{2n}$, $M \ni u = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Let us consider the Hamiltonian dynamical system $\dot{u} = X(u)$, with $X = P_0\, dH$; P_0 is the canonical Poisson tensor and H is given by

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{g_i(\lambda_i)}{\prod_{j \neq i} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)} e^{a\mu_i} \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where g_i are arbitrary smooth functions, each one depending only on the corresponding coordinate λ_i, and a is an arbitrary constant.

The related Newton equations of motion take the form

$$\ddot{\lambda}_k = 2 \sum_{i \neq k} \frac{\dot{\lambda}_i \dot{\lambda}_k}{\lambda_k - \lambda_i} \qquad\qquad (k = 1, \dots, n) \ . \tag{2.2}$$

They were found to be solvable by F. Calogero [2] and recently they have been shown [1] to describe a solvable n-body systems in the plane. Indeed, as remarked in [1], the previous equations describe also a special case of the integrable relativistic n–body problems introduced by S.N. Ruijsenaars and H. Schneider [21].

Now, comparing (2.1) with (1.5) one immediately concludes that $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda};\boldsymbol{\mu}\}$ is a Darboux–Nijenhuis chart for the Hamiltonian H, which is consequently separable (a property unnoticed in [1]):

Proposition 2.1. *The vector field $X = P_0\, dH$ is a Pfaffian QBH vector field; P_0, P_1 and N are given by (1.1), H is the Hamiltonian (2.1) and K is given by*

$$K = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\rho_i\, g_i(\lambda_i)}{\prod_{j\neq i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)} e^{a\mu_i} \ . \tag{2.3}$$

Furthermore, the corresponding Hamilton–Jacobi equation is separable; a complete integral is $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}; b_1, \dots, b_n) = -b_1 t + W(\boldsymbol{\lambda}; b_1, \dots, b_n)$ with

$$W = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int^{\lambda_i} \log\left(\frac{1}{g_i(\xi)} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j\, \xi^{n-j} \right) d\xi \ , \tag{2.4}$$

and the Hamilton equations of motion can be solved by quadratures. □

As it was shown in [2], the Newton equations (2.2) can be linearized by introducing a suitable set of coordinates. As a matter of fact, these coordinates are strictly related with the Nijenhuis tensor (1.1). Indeed, let us consider the minimal polynomial of N given by (1.7): expressing its coefficients $\boldsymbol{c} := (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ in terms of its roots $\boldsymbol{\lambda} := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ by means of the Viète's formulae

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1 &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \\
c_2 &= \sum_{i<j}^{n} \lambda_i \lambda_j \\
c_3 &= -\sum_{i<j<k}^{n} \lambda_i \lambda_j \lambda_k \\
&\ \ \vdots \qquad \vdots \\
c_n &= (-1)^n \prod_{i}^{n} \lambda_i \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

we can introduce the map

$$\Phi : \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mapsto \boldsymbol{c} : c_k = \Phi_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \qquad (k = 1, \dots, n) \tag{2.6}$$

Now, we can easily obtain the following result:

Proposition 2.2. *The evolution of $\boldsymbol{c}$ along the flow of X is given by $\dot{c}_k = aF_k$, where F_k are given by (1.6), with $f_i(\lambda_i;\mu_i) = g_i(\lambda_i)\, e^{a\mu_i}$. So, one has $\ddot{c}_k = 0$.*

Proof. On account of Eq. (2.1), one gets

$$\dot{c}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial \lambda_i}\dot{\lambda}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial \lambda_i}\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu_i} = a\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial \lambda_i}\frac{g_i(\lambda_i)}{\prod_{j\neq i}(\lambda_i-\lambda_j)}e^{a\mu_i} = aF_k \ . \tag{2.7}$$

□

This shows that the dynamics associated with X is trivial when expressed in terms of $\boldsymbol{c}$, as it was already remarked in [1, 2]. It seems to us of some interest to point out the algebraic meaning of the map Φ (2.6), i.e., its relation with the Nijenhuis tensor (1.1).

3. THE DYNAMICAL SYSTEM AND ITS NON CANONICAL BH FORMULATION

Let $\Psi : R^{2n} \to R^{2n}$ be the non canonical map

$$\Psi : u = (\boldsymbol{\lambda};\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mapsto v = (\boldsymbol{c};\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \qquad c_k = \Phi_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\ ; \gamma_k = aF_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\boldsymbol{\mu})\ . \tag{3.1}$$

On account of Prop. 2.2 and of the fact that F_k are integrals of motion for X, it is $\dot{c}_k = aF_k = \gamma_k$ and $\dot{\gamma}_k = a\dot{F}_k = 0$; so, the vector field X is mapped by Ψ into the vector field $Y = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}, 0)^T$ (of course, the whole QBH structure (P_0, P_1) could as well be transformed). Easily enough, for any dynamical system $\dot{v} = Y(v)$ of this form one has the following result:

Proposition 3.1. *The system $\dot{v} = Y(v)$, with $Y = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}, 0)^T$, is BH w.r.t. $Q_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Gamma \\ -\Gamma & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, where $\Gamma := diag(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$. The BH chain is*

$$Q_0\, dh_{j+1} = Q_1\, dh_j \qquad (j = 0, 1, \dots)\ , \tag{3.2}$$

with $h_0 = \log(det\Gamma)$ and $h_j = \frac{1}{2j} Tr(Q_1\, Q_0^{-1})^j = \frac{1}{j}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i^j \quad (j = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$. □

Remark 3.1. For the sake of completeness, we recall that X admits also a Virasoro algebra of graded conformal symmetries τ_j $(j = -1, 0, 1, \dots)$ with $\tau_j = (0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{j+1})^T$ $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^j := (\gamma_1^j, \dots, \gamma_n^j)^T)$. The relation between this algebraic structure and the BH structure is well known [22]. □

Since the BH structure can be transformed from the chart $\{\boldsymbol{c};\boldsymbol{\gamma}\}$ to the chart $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda};\boldsymbol{\mu}\}$, we conclude that the system $\dot{u} = X(u)$, which is QBH w.r.t. (P_0, P_1), is also BH w.r.t. (Q_0, Q_1). The Poisson tensors of the BH formulation can be obtained by transformation (under Ψ) of the Poisson tensors Q_0, Q_1 of Prop. 3.1. We observe that the map Ψ is non canonical w.r.t. Q_0, so in the chart $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda};\boldsymbol{\mu}\}$ it is $Q_0 \neq P_0$; as a

matter of fact, the Poisson pair (Q_0, Q_1) take a quite complicated form in the chart $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{\mu}\}$, being simpler in the chart $\{\boldsymbol{c}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}\}$ (the opposite situation occurs for the pair (P_0, P_1)).

For the sake of clarity, let us consider explicitly the case $n = 2$. The dynamical system $\dot{u} = X(u)$ is of the form (1.3), with H and K given respectively by (2.1) and (2.3):

$$H = \frac{g_1}{\lambda_{12}} e^{a\mu 1} - \frac{g_2}{\lambda_{12}} e^{a\mu_2} \ , \quad K = \frac{\lambda_2 g_1}{\lambda_{12}} e^{a\mu 1} - \frac{\lambda_1 g_2}{\lambda_{12}} e^{a\mu_2} \quad (\lambda_{12} := \lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \ . \tag{3.3}$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}_1 &= \frac{a g_1}{\lambda_{12}} e^{a\mu_1} \\ \dot{\lambda}_2 &= -\frac{a g_2}{\lambda_{12}} e^{a\mu_2} \\ \dot{\mu}_1 &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_1}\left(\frac{g_1}{\lambda_{12}}\right) e^{a\mu_1} - \frac{g_2}{\lambda_{12}^2} e^{a\mu_2} \\ \dot{\mu}_2 &= -\frac{g_1}{\lambda_{12}^2} e^{a\mu_1} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2}\left(\frac{g_2}{\lambda_{12}}\right) e^{a\mu_2} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

This system is separable; a complete integral of the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi equation is $S(\lambda_1, \lambda_2; b_1, b_2) = -b_1 t + W$. According to (2.4), W is given by

$$W = \frac{1}{a} \int^{\lambda_1} d\xi \, \log \frac{b_2 + b_1 \xi}{g_1(\xi)} + \frac{1}{a} \int^{\lambda_2} d\xi \, \log \frac{b_2 + b_1 \xi}{g_2(\xi)} \ , \tag{3.5}$$

therefore the general solution of Hamilton equations is

$$\begin{aligned} t - t_0 &= \frac{1}{a} \int^{\lambda_1} d\xi \, \frac{\xi}{b_2 + b_1 \xi} + \frac{1}{a} \int^{\lambda_2} d\xi \, \frac{\xi}{b_2 + b_1 \xi} \\ \beta &= \frac{1}{a} \int^{\lambda_1} d\xi \, \frac{1}{b_2 + b_1 \xi} + \frac{1}{a} \int^{\lambda_2} d\xi \, \frac{1}{b_2 + b_1 \xi} \\ \mu_1 &= \frac{1}{a} \log \frac{b_2 + b_1 \lambda_1}{g_1(\lambda_1)} \\ \mu_2 &= \frac{1}{a} \log \frac{b_2 + b_1 \lambda_2}{g_2(\lambda_2)} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

As for the map Ψ, it is

$$c_1 = -(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \ , \quad c_2 = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ , \quad \gamma_1 = -aH \ , \quad \gamma_2 = aK \ ; \tag{3.7}$$

the BH dynamical system $\dot{v} = Y(v)$ is given by

$$\dot{c}_1 = \gamma_1 \ , \quad \dot{c}_2 = \gamma_2 \ , \quad \dot{\gamma}_1 = 0 \ , \quad \dot{\gamma}_2 = 0 \ , \tag{3.8}$$

with Hamiltonians

$$h_1 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \ , \qquad h_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2) \ . \tag{3.9}$$

In order to transform this BH structure, it suffices to consider the inverse map Ψ^{-1} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{1,2} &= -\frac{1}{2}c_1 \pm \frac{1}{2}(c_1^2 - 4c_2)^{1/2} \ , \\ \mu_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{a}\log(c_1\gamma_1 - 2\gamma_2 \mp \gamma_1(c_1^2 - 4c_2)^{1/2}) - \frac{1}{a}\log(2a) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

We obtain $h_1 = a(K - H)$, $h_2 = \frac{1}{2}a^2(K^2 + H^2)$ and

$$Q_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ -A^T & B \end{bmatrix} \ , \quad Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C \\ -C^T & D \end{bmatrix} \ ; \tag{3.11}$$

A and C are (2×2) matrices with entries

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &= \frac{(-1)^{i+1}}{a^2\lambda_{12}}\frac{1 + \lambda_i\lambda_j}{g_j}e^{-a\mu_j} \qquad (i,j = 1,2) \\ C_{ij} &= (-1)^{i+j}\left(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_i\lambda_j + \lambda_j(\lambda_i - 1)\frac{g_{j+1}}{g_j}e^{a(\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j)}\right) \quad (i,j = 1,2) \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $\lambda_3 := \lambda_1, g_3 := g_1, \mu_3 := \mu_1$; B and D are (2×2) skew-symmetric matrices with

$$\begin{aligned} B_{21} &= \frac{(1 + \lambda_1\lambda_2)\lambda_{12}}{a^3 g_1 g_2}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_1}(\frac{g_1}{\lambda_{12}^2})e^{-a\mu_2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_2}(\frac{g_2}{\lambda_{12}^2})e^{-a\mu_1}\right) \\ D_{21} &= \frac{1}{a^2\lambda_{12}^3 g_1 g_2}\left((2g_2 + g_2'\lambda_{12})\left(g_1\lambda_2(1 - \lambda_1) + g_2\lambda_1(\lambda_2 - 1)e^{a(\mu_2 - \mu_1)}\right)\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{a^2\lambda_{12}^3 g_1 g_2}\left((2g_1 - g_1'\lambda_{12})\left(g_2\lambda_1(\lambda_2 - 1) + g_1\lambda_2(1 - \lambda_1)e^{a(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}\right)\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Clearly, this BH structure is much more involved than the QBH structure (P_0, P_1).

4. Concluding remarks

The dynamical system considered by F. Calogero in [1], as well as its generalization analyzed in this Letter, is naturally a Pfaffian QBH system; consequently, it is separable and therefore integrable by quadratures, the physical coordinates being just the Darboux-Nijenhuis coordinates w.r.t. (P_0, P_1) (as for other examples of systems which admit this type of formulation, see [23, 24]).

A property of this system, which seems to be rather peculiar, is that the minimal polynomial of the Nijenhuis tensor N directly suggests the introduction of a non canonical map which provides the non canonical BH structure (Q_0, Q_1); this procedure is an example of the strategy mentioned in item i) of the Introduction. In this regard, it is known that any Liouville integrable system can be given infinitely many non canonical BH formulations [9] in a neighborhood of an invariant Liouville torus; to this end, a non canonical map has to be constructed starting from a set of action-angles variables [25]. This procedure is quite similar to the one we have used in this Letter; the main difference is given by the fact that we can construct the non canonical map between the Darboux–Nijenhuis coordinates $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{\mu}\}$ and the coordinates $\{\boldsymbol{c}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}\}$ directly, without passing through the action–angle variables.

As a final remark, let us observe that a quite similar situation occurs if one considers the dynamical system

$$\dot{u} = P_0\, dH \ , \qquad u^T = (s_1, s_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) \ , \qquad H = s_1(1 + s_2^2) \ , \tag{4.1}$$

where P_0 is the canonical Poisson tensor, (s_1, s_2), (θ_1, θ_2) are action-angles variables respectively. This system was introduced by Brouzet [7] as a counterexample to the existence of a canonical BH structure. However, since $n = 2$, it can be endowed with a canonical (not Pfaffian) QBH structure, which is explicitly given by

$$\dot{u} = \frac{1}{H}\, P_1\, dK \ , \qquad K = -\frac{1}{s_1} + 2 \arctan s_2 \ , \qquad P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & S \\ -S & 0 \end{bmatrix} \ , \tag{4.2}$$

with $S = diag(s_1, s_2)$. Thus, the Brouzet's counterexample has both a non canonical BH structure and a canonical QBH one, as well as the system we have considered in this Letter.

Acknowledgments.

We gratefully acknowledge many valuable criticisms by an anonymous referee. One of us (G.T.) takes the occasion to thank F.Calogero and J.-P. Francoise for enlightening discussions.

This work has been partially supported by the GNFM of the Italian CNR and by the project "Metodi geometrici e probabilistici in Fisica Matematica" of the Italian MURST.

References

[1] F. Calogero, *A solvable N-body problem in the plane. I,* J. Math. Phys. **37**(1996), 1735-1759.

[2] F. Calogero, *Motion of Poles and Zeroes of Special Solutions of Nonlinear and Linear Partial Differential Equations and Related Solvable Many–Body Problems,* Nuovo Cimento B **43** (1978), 177–241.

[3] F. Magri, *A simple model of the integrable Hamiltonian equation,* J. Math. Phys. **19** (1978), 1156–1162.

[4] F. Magri, T. Marsico, *Some developments of the concepts of Poisson manifolds in the sense of A. Lichnerowicz,* Gravitation, Electromagnetism and Geometrical Structures, (G. Ferrarese, ed.), Pitagora editrice, Bologna 1996, pp. 207–222.

[5] F.J. Turiel, *Classification locale d'un couple de formes symplectiques Poisson–compatibles,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math **308** (1989), 575–578.

[6] F. Magri, C. Morosi, *A Geometrical Characterization of Integrable Hamiltonian Systems through the Theory of Poisson–Nijenhuis Manifolds,* Quaderno **S/19** (1984), Università di Milano.

[7] R. Brouzet, *Systèmes bihamiltoniens et complète intégrabilité en dimension 4,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. 1 Math. **311** (1990), 895–898.

[8] R. L. Fernandes, *Completely Integrable Bi–Hamiltonian Systems,* J. Dynam. Differential Equations **6** (1994), 53–69.

[9] S. De Filippo, G. Vilasi, G. Marmo, M. Salerno, *A new characterization of completely integrable systems,* Nuovo Cimento B **83** (1984), 97–112.

[10] I.M. Gelfand, I. Zakharevich, *On the local geometry of a bi–Hamiltonian structure,* The Gelfand Mathematical Seminars 1990–92, (L. Corwin et al., eds.), Birkauser, Boston 1993, pp. 51–112.

[11] T. Ratiu, *Euler–Poisson equations on Lie algebras and the N–dimensional heavy rigid body* Amer. Jour. Math. **104** (1982), 409–448.

[12] C. Morosi, L. Pizzocchero, On the Euler equation: bi–Hamiltonian structure and integrals in involution, Lett. Math. Phys. **37** (1996), 117–135.

[13] I. D. Marshall, *The Kowalevski Top: its r–Matrix Interpretation and Bihamiltonian Formulation,* Comm. Math. Phys. (in press).

[14] M. Antonowicz, A. P. Fordy, S. Wojciechowski, *Integrable stationary flows, Miura maps and Bi–Hamiltonian Structures,* Phys. Lett. A **124** (1987), 455-462.

[15] G. Tondo, *On the integrability of stationary and restricted flows of the KdV hierarchy,* J. Phys. A **28** (1995), 5097–5115.

[16] R. Brouzet, R. Caboz, J. Rabenivo, V. Ravoson, *Two degrees of freedom quasi bi-Hamiltonian systems,* J. Phys. A **29** (1996), 2069–2076.

[17] C. Morosi, G. Tondo, *Quasi–Bi–Hamiltonian systems and separability,* J. Phys. A.: Math. Gen. **30** (1997), 2799-2806.

[18] T. Levi-Civita, *Sulla integrazione della equazione di Hamilton–Jacobi per separazione di variabili,* Math. Ann. **59** (1904), 383–397.

[19] A. M. Perelomov, *Integrable systems of classical mechanics and Lie algebras,* Birkhauser, Berlin 1990.

[20] M. Błaszak, *On the separability of bi-Hamiltonian chains with degenerate Poisson structures,* J. Math. Phys. **39** (1998), 3213–3235.

[21] S. N. Ruijsenaars, H. Schneider, *A new class of integrable systems and its relation to solitons,* Ann. Phys. **170** (1986), 370–405.

[22] W. Oevel, *A geometrical approach to integrable systems admitting time dependent invariants,* Topics in soliton theory and exactly solvable nonlinear equations (Oberwolfach 1986), (M. Ablowitz et al., eds.), World Scientific, Singapore 1987, pp. 108–124.

[23] E. V. Ferapontov, A.P. Fordy, *Separable Hamiltonians and integrable systems of hydrodynamic type,* J. Geom. Phys. **21** (1997), 169–182.
[24] M. Błaszak, *Bi-Hamiltonian separable chains on Riemannian manifolds,* Phys. Lett. A. **243** (1998), 25–32.
[25] G. Landi, G. Marmo, G. Vilasi, *Recursion operators: meaning and existence for completely integrable systems,* J. Math. Phys **35** (1994), 808–815.

†C. Morosi, Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza L. Da Vinci 32, I-20133 Milano, Italy
E-mail address: carmor@mate.polimi.it

‡G. Tondo, on leave from Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche, Università degli Studi di Trieste, Piaz.le Europa 1, I-34127 Trieste, Italy.
E-mail address: tondo@univ.trieste.it